

# EXHIBIT H

HIGHLY CONFIDENTIAL - ATTORNEYS' EYES ONLY

Page 1

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA  
SAN FRANCISCO DIVISION

---o0o---

ORACLE AMERICA, INC., )  
Plaintiff, )  
vs. ) No. CV 10-03561 WHA  
GOOGLE, INC., )  
Defendant. )

HIGHLY CONFIDENTIAL - ATTORNEYS' EYES ONLY  
VIDEOTAPED DEPOSITION OF HINKMOND WONG  
THURSDAY, FEBRUARY 16, 2012

PAGES 1 - 161

HIGHLY CONFIDENTIAL - ATTORNEYS' EYES ONLY

Page 13

1 Q. I'm sorry.

2 After you finished with Toshiba MRI -- thank  
3 you for the correction -- in 1994, what was your next  
4 position?

5 A. My next position was a software engineer at 09:53  
6 Sun Microsystems, Inc.

7 Q. When did you start there?

8 A. I started in November of 1994.

9 Q. And what was your first position with  
10 Sun Microsystems, Inc.? 09:53

11 A. My first position, I believe, was staff  
12 engineer.

13 Q. Did there come a time that your title  
14 changed?

15 A. Yes. 09:53

16 Q. When was that?

17 A. That I don't remember.

18 Q. What was your next title?

19 A. My next title was senior staff engineer.

20 Q. And approximately when did you obtain that 09:53  
21 title?

22 A. I don't remember.

23 Q. Did you have another title after that?

24 A. You know, I'm going to correct myself.

25 I believe I first started in November 1994 as member 09:54

HIGHLY CONFIDENTIAL - ATTORNEYS' EYES ONLY

Page 15

1 A. My new title is consulting member of  
2 technical staff.

3 Q. When did you obtain that title?

4 A. I obtained that title in August or September  
5 of 2011.

09:55

6 Q. And that's your current title today?

7 A. Yes.

8 Q. Do you know why you obtained that promotion?

9 MR. NORTON: Objection to form.

10 THE WITNESS: Is there something specific in  
11 your question that you wanted to ask?

09:56

12 BY MR. PAIGE:

13 Q. I'm just wondering if a reason was given to  
14 you for your promotion.

15 A. There were many reasons.

09:56

16 Q. What were they?

17 A. My participation in different technical  
18 projects. My background in mobile programming and  
19 Java ME, which is the Java Micro Edition. My  
20 participation, also, in releases and products that  
21 were shipped. My ability to analyze and to -- analyze  
22 different technologies and consult and advise on those  
23 technologies. And there might have been several other  
24 reasons, working with others, that were more  
25 human resource-related.

09:56

09:57

HIGHLY CONFIDENTIAL - ATTORNEYS' EYES ONLY

Page 16

1 Q. Okay. So you program in Java?

2 A. Yes.

3 Q. How long have you been programming in Java?

4 A. Since -- since about 1997 or 1998.

5 Q. What did you start off programming when you 09:57  
6 started using the Java programming language?

7 A. Can you repeat the question?

8 Q. Sure. When you started using the Java  
9 programming language, what was your first project?

10 A. I'm trying to recall. 09:57

11 I believe my first project when I started  
12 programming in Java was the HotJava browser -- I'm  
13 sorry -- the HotJava applications project.

14 Q. And what was that project?

15 A. That project was a desktop for computers 09:58  
16 written in Java and run on a Java Virtual Machine.

17 Q. What was your next project on Java, if you  
18 recall?

19 A. I believe --

20 MR. NORTON: Objection to form. 09:58

21 Go ahead and answer the question.

22 THE WITNESS: My next project, from what I  
23 remember, was the embedded Java and PersonalJava  
24 projects.

25 BY MR. PAIGE: 09:58

HIGHLY CONFIDENTIAL - ATTORNEYS' EYES ONLY

Page 17

1 Q. And what did those projects involve?

2 A. Those projects involved programming,  
3 designing, implementation, and architecture of Java  
4 technologies for small devices, mobile devices,  
5 embedded devices.

09:59

6 Q. And when did you take part in that project?

7 A. To my best recollection, I took part in that  
8 project from approximately 1997 or late 1997 until --  
9 I'm not sure exactly when the project ended and other  
10 projects I was working on continued as my main  
11 project, but somewhere around 1999, I believe.

09:59

12 Q. Okay. What was your next project after that?

13 A. My next project was PersonalJava. And I  
14 believe that was -- Java 2 Micro Edition started then,  
15 also.

10:00

16 Q. And when was this?

17 A. Somewhere around 1999.

18 Q. And for how long did you stay on that  
19 project?

20 A. That project has continued and kept going as  
21 the Java Micro Edition project. Instead of "J2ME,"  
22 it was called Java ME, or Java Micro Edition.

10:00

23 Q. So are you still working on that project?

24 A. I continue to work on some sustaining parts  
25 of that project. So the project continues, but then

10:00

HIGHLY CONFIDENTIAL - ATTORNEYS' EYES ONLY

Page 23

1           A.   Yes.   During the time with Sun and Oracle,  
2   I've had consultants reporting to me in a task-related  
3   function where I would assign and review their tasks  
4   and, as a group, lead them in the set of tasks we had.  
5   And they did not report to me in terms of a human  
6   resource organizational chart, but in terms of the  
7   projects, they reported to me.

10:08

8           Q.   Who were these consultants?

9           A.   I don't remember their names.

10          Q.   For whom did they work?

10:08

11          A.   They worked for various contract houses for  
12   Sun Microsystems.

13          Q.   When you say "contract houses," what do you  
14   mean?

15          A.   Sun Microsystems had contractors -- preferred  
16   contractors that were the only software programmer  
17   contractors that we could hire on a contract basis,  
18   and they worked for the preferred contract houses that  
19   were the official contractors that were able to be  
20   hired by Sun Microsystems.

10:08

10:09

21          Q.   Okay.   Are you familiar with the Android  
22   system that's at issue in this case?

23          A.   Yes, I am.

24          Q.   When did you first learn of Android?

25          A.   I first learned -- and this is -- is the

10:09

HIGHLY CONFIDENTIAL - ATTORNEYS' EYES ONLY

Page 24

1 question when I first heard about the technology or  
2 read about the technology, just to clarify?

3 Q. Yes.

4 A. I first heard about the technology  
5 approximately in 2006.

10:09

6 Q. How did you hear of it in 2006?

7 A. It was part of project negotiations and a  
8 potential license negotiation between Google and  
9 Sun Microsystems.

10 Q. Were you involved in those negotiations?

10:09

11 A. Yes, I was.

12 Q. How were you involved in those negotiations?

13 [REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

10:10

21 [REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

24 [REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

10:11



: 12

HIGHLY CONFIDENTIAL - ATTORNEYS' EYES ONLY

Page 39

1           A. A publicly released version? That's a  
2 complicated question, because there was the Android  
3 SDK, which has Android technology in it, that was  
4 released early, before any Android phone was released.  
5 That was part of open-source software that was  
6 downloadable in -- I believe it was in 2007, somewhere  
7 around there.

10:30

8           Q. Okay. When did you first see a released  
9 Android phone?

10          A. A released Android phone, I don't recall.  
11 It was after the Android SDK. I don't recall  
12 specifically the date.

10:30

13           [REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

20           [REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

10:31

HIGHLY CONFIDENTIAL - ATTORNEYS' EYES ONLY

Page 64

1 MR. NORTON: Object to the form.

2 THE WITNESS: I don't remember.

3 BY MR. PAIGE:

4 Q. Okay. Now, you were asked to perform certain  
5 tasks for Mark Reinhold related to this case; correct? 11:15

6 A. That is correct.

7 Q. When were you first asked to do these tasks?

8 A. I believe -- I'm not great with dates -- that  
9 it was about three weeks ago, I was asked to perform  
10 these tasks. 11:15

11 Q. Okay. And what tasks were you asked to  
12 perform?

13 A. I was asked to perform, in general, a patent  
14 portfolio analysis and ranking as it pertained to --  
15 with technical analysis, not anything else -- as it 11:16  
16 pertained to the Google negotiations of 2006.

17 Q. Okay. And what specifically were you asked  
18 to do in terms of a patent portfolio analysis?

19 A. For the patent portfolio analysis, I was  
20 asked -- with my expertise in Java ME, which is Java 11:16  
21 Micro Edition, meant for smartphones, meant for mobile  
22 devices, my background in creating technology --  
23 creating issue patents for Java ME and Java technology  
24 in general, my dealings with the Java community  
25 process on standards bodies and creating 11:16

HIGHLY CONFIDENTIAL - ATTORNEYS' EYES ONLY

Page 65

1 specifications for Java, my experience with  
2 negotiations, sitting in on a meeting with Google and  
3 talking to Andy Rubin and negotiating with the Google  
4 engineers on what we had in terms of our stack and our  
5 technology -- to help provide information to 11:16  
6 Dr. Reinhold in his final report about our patent  
7 portfolio as it applied to the 2006 negotiations with  
8 Google.

9 Q. Okay. Over what period of time did your work  
10 take place? 11:17

11 A. I believe it was a two-week period, starting  
12 about three weeks ago. Again, I'm not great with  
13 dates, so...

14 Q. Were you doing this full-time or did you have  
15 other responsibilities during this period? 11:17

16 A. I had other responsibilities; however,  
17 I was -- this is under legal guidance, under legal  
18 directive, that I was told that this was the highest  
19 priority, and I made it the number-one priority during  
20 that time. 11:17

21 Q. Okay. For those two weeks?

22 A. For those two weeks, yes.

23 Q. Approximately how many hours did you spend on  
24 this project in those two weeks?

25 A. Ooh. Approximately -- we even worked over 11:17

HIGHLY CONFIDENTIAL - ATTORNEYS' EYES ONLY

Page 66

1 e-mail on weekends, so there is -- there is a -- about  
2 10 days, six to eight hours. Anywhere between --  
3 anywhere between approximately 50 to 60 hours for  
4 myself only, not for the other team members, because I  
5 know Dr. Reinhold worked much, much longer hours over 11:18  
6 the weekend than I did at some point.

7 Q. Okay. When you say "we did this over e-mail  
8 on the weekends," do you mean you sent e-mail to and  
9 from one another?

10 A. No. There was -- you know, I'm not sure if 11:18  
11 I'm remembering this right. I think we worked on our  
12 spreadsheets individually at some point during the  
13 night during the week, and I think Dr. Reinhold and  
14 Mr. Rose worked on their spreadsheets over the  
15 weekend. Now that I think about it, I don't recall 11:19  
16 e-mails going back and forth.

17 Q. Okay. What tasks did you -- were you  
18 assigned?

19 A. What tasks was I assigned? In general, as  
20 I've stated, the task was to -- as my background in 11:19  
21 Java ME and as my background as an engineer and as a  
22 Java architect in terms of providing Java technology  
23 for smartphones pertained and as my experience with  
24 the Google negotiations, sitting in on that meeting  
25 and talking to Andy Rubin, reading his product 11:19

HIGHLY CONFIDENTIAL - ATTORNEYS' EYES ONLY

Page 67

1 requirement and understanding the background behind  
2 the request back in 2006, I would provide information  
3 and my technical opinion on the rankings and the  
4 technical merits of our patent portfolio and provide  
5 that information within our group in discussion and in 11:20  
6 consensus building on that ranking to Dr. Reinhold.

7 Q. Okay. What was the first step in doing that?

8 A. The first step in doing that was going over  
9 a -- any of the documents that related to the Google  
10 negotiation back in 2006 and trying to understand what 11:20  
11 was the original request coming from Google and what  
12 they wanted from Sun Microsystems at the time in terms  
13 of their technology for their Android phone. We  
14 called that project "Armstrong" on our side, and  
15 that's the project that Vineet Gupta was working on 11:21  
16 as the sales opportunity to Google.

17 Q. And what did you do to understand those  
18 requirements?

19 A. Under legal directive, we -- we were able to  
20 review documents that were produced from Google that 11:21  
21 included the product requirements document, and also  
22 we reviewed the project plan that Vivian Wong provided  
23 to -- to our director at the time, Mark Fulks, to  
24 understand the effort that would be estimated to  
25 provide and release to Google in terms of what Java 11:21

HIGHLY CONFIDENTIAL - ATTORNEYS' EYES ONLY

Page 69

1 take and how many engineers would be required for  
2 purposes of this report?

3 A. For this report, no.

4 Q. Yes, what did you do for this report?

5 A. For this report, from that project plan we 11:23  
6 were able to -- and from other documents, we were able  
7 to determine what we were trying to deliver to Google  
8 in terms of Java technology, and from that idea of  
9 what Google was requiring and requesting and what we  
10 were trying to deliver as part of the project plan and 11:23  
11 the effort estimates, we determined which of our  
12 patents in the patent portfolio were important -- of  
13 technical importance for Google.

14 Q. And how did you do that?

15 A. That's a broad question. But with our 11:23  
16 background, each individual background we brought to  
17 the table, we had various perspectives on what makes  
18 a -- a good Java technology stack meant for a  
19 smartphone. With that experience and knowledge and  
20 background, each engineer was able to provide 11:24  
21 discussion points and be able to use their background  
22 in understanding the requirements for a Java Virtual  
23 Machine, for Java specifications, and for Java -- for  
24 performance and for things like size, the footprint  
25 size, and for things such as security, what would be 11:24

HIGHLY CONFIDENTIAL - ATTORNEYS' EYES ONLY

Page 70

1 of technical merit.

2 And with that as the guidance and with that  
3 in our minds, we helped go through our patent  
4 portfolio, deciding which ones were of most value and  
5 which ones were of substantial value and which ones 11:24  
6 fell among that ranking in our patent portfolio.

7 Q. Did you have a particular area of patents  
8 that you looked at?

9 A. After -- after going through the requirements  
10 and understanding the documents from during that time 11:25  
11 in 2006, we -- we -- well, George Simion, our attorney  
12 at Oracle, was able to search for and find  
13 Java-related patents from the time when the  
14 negotiations -- being submitted during the time of the  
15 negotiations with Google. And from that, there were 11:25  
16 several spreadsheets, lists of patents in our patent  
17 portfolio that we were as a group going to go through  
18 and see which technology groups -- I should back up  
19 here.

20 We decided which technology groups 11:26  
21 represented or which blocks represented the  
22 requirements and the requests of Google. Those  
23 technology blocks represented areas of Java technology  
24 stack that would be very important to match with what  
25 they requested. And from those technology blocks, 11:26



HIGHLY CONFIDENTIAL - ATTORNEYS' EYES ONLY

Page 98

1 MR. NORTON: Objection to form.

2 THE WITNESS: Again, I don't -- I don't know.

3 BY MR. PAIGE:

4 Q. Was it five? ten?

5 A. It was probably less than five. 12:04

6 Q. Okay. So fewer than five patents, you spent  
7 30 minutes on. Is that it?

8 MR. NORTON: Objection to form.

9 THE WITNESS: Given -- given that we spent  
10 time covering all of the patents, then there was no 12:04  
11 patent that we covered more than 30 minutes  
12 individually.

13 BY MR. PAIGE:

14 Q. When you were deciding the scale of 1 to 3 to  
15 rank these six patents -- 12:04

16 A. Yes.

17 Q. -- did you draw on the past work you had done  
18 to perform that evaluation of 1 to 3?

19 A. On the past work that I have done?

20 Q. Yes. 12:04

21 A. So that means for the patent analysis?

22 Q. Yes.

23 A. I -- I had that knowledge, but I couldn't  
24 find that, so that I used mainly -- what the goal of  
25 the project was at hand was to match what Google had 12:04

HIGHLY CONFIDENTIAL - ATTORNEYS' EYES ONLY

Page 99

1 requested and required in 2006 during the business  
2 negotiation. That was foremost on my mind and my  
3 focus when rating the 1-through-3 scale --

4 Q. Okay.

5 A. -- for the patents.

12:05

6 Q. And I hear you saying "mainly" and "mostly."

7 A. Right.

8 Q. I want to know if you used any of the past  
9 analysis that you had done when evaluating these on a  
10 1 to 3 scale for purposes of this project.

12:05

11 A. No, not consciously.

12 Q. What do you mean by "not consciously"?

13 A. Of course I had the knowledge of doing  
14 analysis, but I made sure to confine my bias and  
15 confine my focus when I'm doing the rating to just the  
16 goal at hand, which is to match what Google had  
17 requested in 2006.

12:05

18 Q. When you say "confine my bias," what do you  
19 mean by "bias"?

20 A. Well, whatever information I had from the  
21 patent analysis.

12:05

22 Q. How was that a bias?

23 A. Actually, maybe it's not bias. It's more of  
24 knowledge, whatever my knowledge was from 2006.

25 Q. Okay. So you chose not to take into account

12:06

HIGHLY CONFIDENTIAL - ATTORNEYS' EYES ONLY

Page 100

1 information that you had about those patents in  
2 carrying out this analysis; is that right?

3 A. I chose to make it first and foremost about  
4 what Google had requested and required in 2006 in the  
5 business negotiations.

12:06

6 Q. But did you use the information you had  
7 learned from past analysis in order to rank these  
8 1 through 3?

9 A. Not to my knowledge.

10 Q. What do you mean, "not to your knowledge"?

12:06

11 A. Of course it was in my brain, so all that  
12 experience of the patent analysis was in my brain, but  
13 I confined that so -- I confined that so that I  
14 focused only on the task at hand, which was the --  
15 qualifying that as what Google had requested for a  
16 smartphone for what we were doing in business  
17 negotiations during 2006.

12:06

18 Q. Did you have any writings memorializing your  
19 analysis of those six patents?

20 A. Did I have any writings?

12:06

21 MR. NORTON: Objection to form.

22 THE WITNESS: So, personally, it wasn't my  
23 writings, but -- well, that's privileged information,  
24 but I don't -- I don't know if we -- I can give that?

25 MR. NORTON: Can I help a little bit?

12:07

HIGHLY CONFIDENTIAL - ATTORNEYS' EYES ONLY

Page 103

1 Q. Okay. And you chose to ignore that knowledge  
2 for purposes of ranking these patents; right?

3 A. Yes, that is correct.

4 Q. Okay. Why did you choose to ignore your past  
5 work on these patents for purposes of this project? 12:09

6 A. That was not part of this project. Part of  
7 this project was not patent analysis for litigation.  
8 This was for analysis of how appropriate these patents  
9 were for smartphone. So this was a totally different  
10 task than what we did in 2007, in 2010. 12:09

11 Q. Okay. Now, when you initially reviewed these  
12 patents, these 200 to 300 in the group that you had  
13 here --

14 A. Yes.

15 Q. -- what did you do to rank them? 12:09

16 MR. NORTON: Objection to form.

17 THE WITNESS: I believe I answered that also  
18 before. I took a look at the abstract to see if I  
19 understood what the patent was, and if not, then I  
20 referred to the description for a better 12:09  
21 understanding, and then finally the claims in the  
22 actual patent itself to clarify any of the other  
23 details.

24 BY MR. PAIGE:

25 Q. What was the process you ended up using to -- 12:10

HIGHLY CONFIDENTIAL - ATTORNEYS' EYES ONLY

Page 145

1           A. In addition to myself, the engineers involved  
2 were Dr. Reinhold himself, Dr. Kessler, John Rose, and  
3 Chris Plummer.

4           Q. Can you explain what experience you have that  
5 allowed you to first just identify the technology  
6 blocks that would be relevant to a smartphone platform  
7 in 2006?

01:50

8           A. So my experience has been working with Java  
9 since the very beginning of the formation of the Java  
10 language. I started in 1997 working on Java, and then  
11 continuing on to work specifically on embedded Java  
12 and PersonalJava and Java ME, which were the versions  
13 and editions of Java that ran on smartphones and  
14 cell phones and embedded device. So I had knowledge,  
15 experience, and architectural background on that  
16 technology, plus I sat in on meetings with Google in  
17 terms of being able to determine what their  
18 requirements were for their Android platform and what  
19 we had in our Java ME technology that would match  
20 that.

01:51

01:51

01:51

21           (Discussion off the record.)

22 BY MR. NORTON:

23           Q. Prior to being involved in this project with  
24 Dr. Reinhold, had you ever been involved in developing  
25 a smartphone stack?

01:51

HIGHLY CONFIDENTIAL - ATTORNEYS' EYES ONLY

Page 146

1           A. Yes, I have been involved when we created our  
2 Java ME connected device configuration platform for  
3 the Samsung Instinct 2, which is a smartphone that was  
4 released back in 2009, I believe, or 2008. And that  
5 was a smartphone that shipped with our Java ME  
6 technology and very similar to the Android phone.

01:52

7           Q. Now, have you worked with the other engineers  
8 who were involved in this project prior to the project  
9 that you did with Dr. Reinhold?

10          A. Yes, I've worked with other engineers.

01:52

11          Q. And are you familiar with their own  
12 experience in Java technology?

13          A. I'm familiar from my dealings as their  
14 colleagues of what they have done in Java technology,  
15 yes.

01:52

16          Q. And do you believe that the other engineers  
17 who were in the room with you -- strike that.

18                Do you have a view as to whether or not the  
19 other engineers in this project had adequate  
20 experience to be able to identify the relevant  
21 technology groups in smartphone platform as of 2006?

01:53

22               MR. PAIGE: Object to the form.

23               THE WITNESS: Yes. In my own words,  
24 I believe that they did have the qualifications,  
25 experience, and knowledge and all the background

01:53

HIGHLY CONFIDENTIAL - ATTORNEYS' EYES ONLY

Page 147

1 needed to perform this task.

2 BY MR. NORTON:

3 Q. And did -- what experience do you have that  
4 would allow you to rate the individual patents in this  
5 particular portfolio on a scale of 1 to 3?

01:53

6 A. My -- my specific experience has been, again,  
7 working on Java ME technology that was produced and  
8 shipped in the smartphone; sitting in on a meeting  
9 with Google and hearing what they specifically wanted  
10 for their Android phone and understanding from their  
11 documents what their requirements were for that

01:53

12 Android phone; and then using my experience as an  
13 architect and a Java ME engineer on the different  
14 technology components that would make a -- not only a  
15 functioning version of Java technology to run on that  
16 phone, but one that would run with the proper speed  
17 and size -- which is very important, to have a small  
18 size on a phone -- and also to have the correct  
19 security and other pieces that -- that I've -- over  
20 time, through my experience, know about for the  
21 particular environment that they were looking for back  
22 in 2006 for the Google Android phone.

01:54

01:54

23 Q. Okay. And based on your experience with the  
24 other engineers involved in this project, do you have  
25 a view as to whether those engineers have sufficient

01:54

HIGHLY CONFIDENTIAL - ATTORNEYS' EYES ONLY

Page 148

1 experience and knowledge and skill to rank the  
2 individual patents on the 3-point scale that you came  
3 up with?

4 MR. PAIGE: Object to the form.

5 THE WITNESS: Yes. I believe during the 01:55  
6 exercise, the other engineers had many differing areas  
7 where we made sure to cover a broad range of expertise  
8 in terms of engineers and Java technology, and the  
9 other engineers brought to the table their wide and  
10 vast knowledge and experience to be able to rank and 01:55  
11 rate properly the patents in our patent portfolio.

12 BY MR. NORTON:

13 Q. Is there anyone else who works at Oracle  
14 today that you -- who, had they been added to the  
15 team, would have made the results of this exercise 01:55  
16 more accurate?

17 MR. PAIGE: Object to the form.

18 THE WITNESS: No, I don't believe adding any  
19 other engineers from Oracle to the team that was  
20 producing the exercise would have added any more to 01:55  
21 the exercise.

22 BY MR. NORTON:

23 Q. Okay. Now, as a result of the work you did  
24 with the other engineers, was the group able to come  
25 up with any kind of ranking of the patents that you 01:56



HIGHLY CONFIDENTIAL - ATTORNEYS' EYES ONLY

Page 153

1 technology value or the value that would have been  
2 appropriate for the importance -- level of importance  
3 as addressed by the product requirements document and  
4 other documents and meetings we had with Google, for  
5 their requests for Java for a smartphone at the time 02:01  
6 in 2006.

7 Q. And then I think in terms of the process of  
8 reviewing the patents, were you able to discern which  
9 category a patent should be assigned to based on the  
10 information in the abstract, the description -- well, 02:01  
11 the abstract and the description?

12 MR. PAIGE: Object to the form.

13 MR. NORTON: Let me strike that and try that  
14 again.

15 Q. In terms of the process of reviewing the 02:02  
16 patents, were you able to determine which category a  
17 patent should be assigned to based on the information  
18 in the abstract, the description, and the inventors?

19 MR. PAIGE: Object to the form.

20 THE WITNESS: Yes. So in the exercise we 02:02  
21 needed to rate the patents, and we were able to do  
22 that because the abstract had information about the  
23 patents, and as -- as engineers, we -- and engineers  
24 that are familiar with day-to-day activities of  
25 working with these patents and working with the 02:02

HIGHLY CONFIDENTIAL - ATTORNEYS' EYES ONLY

Page 154

1 technology that is represented by these patents, we  
2 could understand and identify quickly at times what  
3 the abstract was trying to describe as what the patent  
4 did. And if we didn't understand it, we could quickly  
5 go to the description. And then if we needed even 02:03  
6 more information, we could just see from the inventor  
7 that, yes or no, in a minute or less figure out if  
8 this was an important patent or not-important patent.

9 MR. NORTON: I have no further questions.

10 Thank you very much. 02:03

11 MR. PAIGE: Just one further question,  
12 Mr. Wong.

13 EXAMINATION

14 BY MR. PAIGE:

15 Q. You referred just now in your answers to 02:03  
16 using your knowledge gained in 2006 from Google  
17 Android negotiations; right?

18 A. Yes.

19 Q. Okay. And you had said earlier today that  
20 you didn't use any of the knowledge you got in your 02:03  
21 patent analysis in the 2007 time frame; right?

22 A. That's correct.

23 Q. How were you able to separate out what you  
24 learned from the Google Android in 2006 from your  
25 patent analysis in 2007? 02:03

HIGHLY CONFIDENTIAL - ATTORNEYS' EYES ONLY

Page 157

1 I declare under penalty of perjury  
2 under the laws of the State of California  
3 that the foregoing is true and correct.

4 Executed on \_\_\_\_\_, 2012,  
5 at \_\_\_\_\_, \_\_\_\_\_.

6  
7  
8  
9  
10  
11 \_\_\_\_\_  
12 SIGNATURE OF THE WITNESS  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25

HIGHLY CONFIDENTIAL - ATTORNEYS' EYES ONLY

Page 158

1 STATE OF CALIFORNIA ) ss:

2  
3 I, SANDRA LEE HOCKIN, C.S.R. No. 7372, do hereby  
4 certify:

5 That the foregoing deposition testimony was  
6 taken before me at the time and place therein set  
7 forth and at which time the witness was administered  
8 the oath;

9 That the testimony of the witness and all  
10 objections made by counsel at the time of the  
11 examination were recorded stenographically by me,  
12 and were thereafter transcribed under my direction  
13 and supervision, and that the foregoing pages  
14 contain a full, true and accurate record of all  
15 proceedings and testimony to the best of my skill  
16 and ability.

17 I further certify that I am neither counsel for  
18 any party to said action, nor am I related to any  
19 party to said action, nor am I in any way interested  
20 in the outcome thereof.

21 IN WITNESS WHEREOF, I have subscribed my name  
22 this 17th day of February, 2012.

23  
24 \_\_\_\_\_  
25 SANDRA LEE HOCKIN, C.S.R. No. 7372